

# **EXHIBIT F**

1 Steven J. Boranian (SBN 174183)  
2 Email: sboranian@reedsmith.com  
3 Mark A. Sentenac (SBN 286810)  
4 Email: msentenac@reedsmith.com  
5 REED SMITH LLP  
6 101 Second Street  
7 Suite 1800  
8 San Francisco, CA 94105-3659  
9 Telephone: +1 415 543 8700  
10 Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269

11 Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and  
12 Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.

13  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 WAYNE RUDEN,  
18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.  
20 C. R. BARD, INC., a New Jersey corporation,  
21 BARD PERIPHERAL VASCULAR, INC. (a  
22 subsidiary and/or division of defendant C. R.  
23 BARD, INC.) an Arizona corporation,  
24 CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER,  
25 and DOES 1-100 INCLUSIVE,

26 Defendants.

27 Case No.: 3:15-cv-05189-EMC

28 Honorable Edward M. Chen

**DEFENDANTS C. R. BARD, INC. AND  
BARD PERIPHERAL VASCULAR, INC.'S  
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO  
STAY ALL PROCEEDINGS PENDING A  
RULING ON TRANSFER BY THE  
JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT  
LITIGATION TO MDL 2641;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Date: January 14, 2016  
Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Courtroom: 5

Compl. Filed: October 7, 2015

[Filed Concurrently With Declaration Of Steven  
J. Boranian In Support Of Motion To Stay, and  
[Proposed] Order]

29 Case No.: 3:15-cv-05189-EMC

30 DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STAY PENDING TRANSFER TO MULTIDISTRICT  
31 PROCEEDINGS; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF

1                   **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on January 14, 2016 at 1:30 p.m., or as soon as the matter  
3 can be heard in Courtroom 5 of the above-entitled Court, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 17th  
4 Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102, Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.  
5 (collectively, "Bard" or "Defendants") will and hereby do move for a stay of all proceedings in this  
6 matter pending transfer of this action by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the  
7 Multidistrict Litigation titled *In Re: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation* (MDL No. 2641),  
8 pending in the District of Arizona. This Motion is made on the grounds that a stay of proceedings in  
9 this case is necessary and appropriate to achieve the judicial economies that underlie 28 U.S.C. §  
10 1407. Additionally, Defendants will be substantially prejudiced by duplicative discovery and motion  
11 practice if a stay is not put in place.

12                  This Motion is based on this Notice, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support  
13 of the Motion to Stay, the Declaration of Steven J. Boranian in Support thereof, all papers filed in  
14 relation to Defendants' Motion, the complete files and records in this action, matters that may be  
15 judicially noticed, and any oral or documentary evidence that may be presented at the hearing on this  
16 matter.

17  
18                  DATED: November 17, 2015

19                  REED SMITH LLP

20  
21                  By: /s/ Steven J. Boranian  
22                      Steven J. Boranian  
23                      Mark A. Sentenac  
24                      Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and  
25                      Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. (collectively “Defendants” or  
3 “Bard”) respectfully move this Court to stay all proceedings in this action, including any ruling on a  
4 motion to remand the plaintiff may file, pending a decision by the United States Judicial Panel on  
5 Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) on transfer of this action to the District of Arizona as part of MDL  
6 2641, *In Re: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation*. It is within this Court’s powers to grant  
7 Defendants’ motion to stay, which furthers the interests of judicial economy, and ensures that  
8 Defendants are not subject to duplicative litigation and inconsistent rulings on the same issue. A  
9 stay is appropriate because Defendants will be prejudiced absent a stay, whereas the plaintiff will  
10 suffer no prejudice.

## I. BACKGROUND

**A. MDL No. 2641**

13       Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407(a) authorizes transfer to a coordinated or consolidated pretrial  
14 proceeding where “civil actions involving one or more common questions of fact are pending in  
15 different districts.” Pursuant to this authority, on August 17, 2015, the JPML ordered that  
16 centralization was appropriate for cases involving allegations of defects in the various models of  
17 Bard’s retrievable inferior vena cava filters (“IVC filters”). *See* Declaration of Steven J. Boranian In  
18 Support of Motion to Stay (“Boranian Decl.”), at ¶ 2. The JPML then created *In Re: Bard IVC*  
19 *Filters Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2641, transferred 22 cases, and assigned the litigation to  
20 Judge David G. Campbell of the District of Arizona. *See* Boranian Decl., at ¶ 2, Exhibit “A”,  
21 August 17, 2015 Transfer Order for MDL 2641. Since that time, the JPML has transferred  
22 numerous cases to MDL 2641. *See* Boranian Decl. ¶ 2.

## B. The Instant Action

24 The plaintiff filed this action in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County  
25 of San Francisco on or about October 7, 2015. *See* Boranian Decl. ¶ 3. Bard timely removed this  
26 action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California on November 12,  
27 2015. *See* Boranian Decl. ¶ 4. Diversity jurisdiction exists because defendant California Pacific  
28 Medical Center has been fraudulently misjoined and, accordingly, its citizenship should be

1 disregarded for determining diversity of citizenship under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). *See, e.g., Tapscott v.*  
 2 *MS Dealer Serv. Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1353, 1360 (11th Cir. 1996), *abrogated on other grounds in Cohen*  
 3 *v. Office Depot, Inc.*, 204 F.3d 1069 (11th Cir. 2000); *see also Sutton v. Davol, Inc.*, 251 F.R.D. 500,  
 4 505 (E.D. Cal. 2008) (applying the doctrine of fraudulent joinder and holding that the plaintiff's  
 5 joinder of a non-diverse, medical malpractice defendant in a product liability case was "improper").  
 6 Complete diversity of citizenship exists between the plaintiff and all other defendants and the  
 7 amount in controversy requirement is satisfied. *See* Bard's Notice of Removal [Dkt. No. 1], at ¶¶  
 8 19-28.

9 The plaintiff in this case makes the same allegations as the plaintiffs in all other cases in  
 10 MDL 2641 – namely, that one of Bard's IVC filters was allegedly defectively designed and/or  
 11 manufactured, and that Bard failed to provide adequate warnings about the filter. Therefore, this  
 12 case is appropriate for inclusion in MDL 2641. On November 13, 2015, pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the  
 13 Rules of Procedure of the JPML, Defendants submitted a Notice of Potential Tag-Along to the  
 14 JPML, seeking an order to transfer this action to MDL 2641. *See* Boranian Decl. ¶ 5. The JPML  
 15 routinely issues conditional transfer orders for cases such as this one and finalizes those orders in  
 16 spite of any objections by plaintiffs about federal subject matter jurisdiction. *See, e.g.*, Boranian  
 17 Decl. ¶ 6, Exhibit "B", Transfer Order, MDL No. 2187, *In re C. R. Bard, Inc., Pelvic Repair System*  
 18 *Products Liability Litigation* (J.P.M.L. June 11, 2013) (transferring cases for consolidation despite  
 19 pending objections to federal jurisdiction).

## 20 II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

### 21 A. The Legal Standards for a Motion to Stay Are Established

22 A federal court has the authority to stay proceedings as part of its inherent power to "control  
 23 the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and  
 24 for litigants." *Landis v. North Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). Notably, "a majority of courts  
 25 have concluded that it is often appropriate to stay preliminary pretrial proceedings while a motion to  
 26 transfer and consolidate is pending with the MDL Panel because of the judicial resources that are  
 27 conserved." *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1362 (C.D. Cal. 1997); *see also Hardin*  
 28 *v. Merck & Co., Inc.*, No. C 07-0070 SBA, 2007 WL 1056790, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2007)

1 (staying the action pending a transfer decision by the JPML). Federal district courts grant motions to  
 2 stay pending a transfer decision by the JPML even when a party files a motion to remand for lack of  
 3 subject matter jurisdiction, which then allows the MDL transferee court to consistently rule on  
 4 jurisdiction issues that are likely to appear in other similar cases. *See, e.g., Hardin*, 2007 WL  
 5 1056790, at \*3 (staying action pending a decision by the JPML concerning transfer and noting that  
 6 “[t]o do otherwise invites divergent results on identical law and facts”). Indeed, where, as here, the  
 7 “jurisdictional issue of a motion to remand is similar or identical to those in cases transferred or  
 8 likely to be transferred to the MDL transferee court, the court **should stay** the action.” *Id.* at \*2  
 9 (emphasis added).

10 A stay pending a transfer decision by the JPML serves the primary purposes of consolidation,  
 11 which are “to eliminate duplicative discovery, prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, . . . and conserve  
 12 the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.” *In re California Retail Natural Gas &*  
*Elec. Antitrust Litig.*, 150 F. Supp. 2d 1383, 1384 (J.P.M.L. 2001). Indeed, the leading authority on  
 14 managing complex litigation, the Manual for Complex Litigation published by the Federal Judicial  
 15 Center, advises that “[a] stay pending the Panel’s decision [on transfer] can increase efficiency and  
 16 consistency, particularly when the [potential] transferor court believes that a transfer order is likely  
 17 and when [any] pending motions raise issues likely to be raised in other cases as well.” Manual for  
 18 Complex Litigation (Fourth) § 22.35 (2004). It is also the U.S. JPML’s current opinion that “the  
 19 transferee judge is in the best position to determine jurisdictional issues.” *See* U.S. Judicial Panel on  
 20 Multidistrict Litig., Fed. Judicial Ctr., Ten Steps to Better Case Mgmt.: A Guide for Multidistrict  
 21 Litig. Transferee Judges 5 (2d ed. 2014) (available at <http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/mdl-guides>)  
 22 (last visited on Apr. 10, 2015). Thus, the JPML has endorsed the prevailing rule that courts can and  
 23 should stay proceedings where it is in the interest of judicial economy to do so. In accordance with  
 24 these authorities, this Court should stay this action pending the decision by the JPML to transfer this  
 25 case to MDL 2641.

26 Courts analyze three factors when determining whether to issue a stay of proceedings  
 27 pending the JPML’s decision on transfer: (1) the judicial resources that would be saved by avoiding  
 28 duplicative litigation if the cases are in fact coordinated; (2) hardship and inequity to the moving  
 Case No.: 3:15-cv-05189-EMC

1 party if the action is not stayed; and (3) potential prejudice to the non-moving party. *Rivers*, 980 F.  
 2 Supp. at 1360; *Asmann v. Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc.*, Civil Action No. 12-1060-KHV/DJW, 2012  
 3 WL 1136865, at \*4-5 (D. Kan. Apr. 4, 2012). When applied to this matter, these factors weigh  
 4 heavily in favor of staying this case pending transfer to MDL 2641.

#### 5 **B. Judicial Economy is Served by Staying this Case**

##### 6 **1. A Stay Pending the JPML'S Transfer Decision Would Conserve Judicial Resources**

7 A stay of proceedings pending transfer to the MDL court will “further the interest of judicial  
 8 economy and consistency that underlies the MDL statute.” *In re Vioxx Prod. Liab. Cases*, No.  
 9 05cv0943DMS(LSP), 2005 WL 6573263, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. July 11, 2005). Indeed, the purpose of  
 10 multidistrict litigation is to coordinate the pretrial management of actions sharing common facts in a  
 11 just and efficient manner. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a). Allowing this action to proceed without a stay  
 12 when it will likely be consolidated for pretrial proceedings with other cases sharing similar facts as  
 13 part of an ongoing MDL would undermine that purpose. Even if the plaintiff challenges Defendants’  
 14 removal, such a challenge would not stop the JPML’s transfer of this action to MDL 2641 because  
 15 the Panel has consistently ruled that “jurisdictional issues do not present an impediment to transfer.”  
 16 *See* Boranian Decl., Exhibit B. Therefore, judicial economy is best served by this Court not  
 17 expending resources “familiarizing itself with the intricacies of a case” that will be coordinated for  
 18 pretrial management before a transferee judge. *See Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360.

19 Moreover, issuing a stay and allowing the MDL transferee Court to rule on the plaintiff’s  
 20 potential motion to remand is appropriate. In fact, the “general rule is for federal courts to defer  
 21 ruling on pending motions to remand in MDL litigation until after the [JPML] has transferred the  
 22 case to the MDL [court].” *Jackson v. Johnson & Johnson, Inc.*, No. 01-2113 DA, 2001 WL  
 23 34048067, at \*7 (W.D. Tenn. Apr. 3, 2001); *see also Garza v. Organon USA, Inc.*, No. C 13-04988  
 24 RS, 2013 WL 6443433, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2013) (granting stay and deferring ruling on remand  
 25 motion because a stay “would serve judicial economy and guard against judicial inconsistency.”);  
 26 *Nichols v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc.*, No. C 11-04748 JW, 2011 WL 5335619, at \*2-3 (N.D. Cal.  
 27 Nov. 2, 2011) (granting stay pending JPML ruling on transfer and denying remand as premature,  
 28 because a stay would “prevent the Court from needlessly duplicating work that will be done by the

1 MDL transferee court, and would also eliminate the possibility of this Court issuing a ruling  
 2 inconsistent with the MDL court's.”).

3 **2. The Risk Of Duplicative Proceedings And Inconsistent Rulings On Issues Likely To  
 4 Recur Warrants A Stay**

5 Although Defendants timely and properly removed this action based on diversity jurisdiction,  
 6 Defendants anticipate that the plaintiff may file a motion to remand given that he has fraudulently  
 7 misjoined an in-state, non-diverse health care provider to defeat diversity. This exact issue,  
 8 fraudulent misjoinder of a diversity-defeating in-state physician, has been repeatedly raised in other  
 9 products liability drug or device MDL proceedings. *See, e.g., Sutton*, 251 F.R.D. at 505 (severing  
 10 and remanding the plaintiff’s claims against a fraudulently misjoined, non-diverse California  
 11 defendant, allowing the product liability claims to be transferred to an MDL). Given that MDL 2641  
 12 is newly established, it is likely that this issue will arise in other cases. Accordingly, “having  
 13 individual courts decide an issue likely to be raised in multiple proceedings would be an inefficient  
 14 use of judicial resources.” *Rubio v. Arndal*, No. 1:13-cv-0027-LJO-BAM, 2013 WL 796669, at \*5  
 15 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2013). However, judicial resources will be conserved if this jurisdictional issue,  
 16 which is likely to arise in other cases transferred to MDL 2641, can be heard and ruled on by Judge  
 17 Campbell.

18 Additionally, if individual courts were to separately rule on this issue of jurisdiction, there is  
 19 a potential for inconsistent rulings, which is one of the reasons why Congress established the  
 20 multidistrict litigation procedure. *See In re Vioxx Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 360 F. Supp. 2d at 1354  
 21 (“Centralization under [28 U.S.C. § 1407] is necessary in order to eliminate duplicative discovery,  
 22 avoid inconsistent pretrial rulings, and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the  
 23 judiciary.”). Preventing inconsistent rulings is particularly important for a motion to remand  
 24 because a decision to remand is not subject to appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d). Accordingly,  
 25 to preserve judicial resources and prevent inconsistent rulings and duplicative litigation on the same  
 26 issue of jurisdiction, this Court should stay all proceedings so this case can be coordinated for  
 27 pretrial proceedings with the other similar cases in MDL 2641. *See, e.g., Hardin*, 2007 WL  
 28 1056790, at \*3 (staying case pending transfer to an MDL proceeding despite a motion to remand and

1 noting that, “the policy of consistent rulings favors allowing [the MDL] court to decide the remand  
 2 issue . . . To do otherwise invites divergent results on identical law and facts”); *see also Rubio*, 2013  
 3 WL 796669, at \*5 (staying case pending transfer to a “newly created” MDL proceeding because,  
 4 *inter alia*, judicial economy is served and there is a risk of inconsistent rulings on the issue of  
 5 fraudulent misjoinder that is likely to arise in future cases).

6           **C. Bard Will be Prejudiced Absent a Stay, Whereas Plaintiff will Suffer No Prejudice if a**  
 7           **Stay Pending Transfer to MDL 2641 is Ordered**

8 Plaintiff will not suffer prejudice if a stay is granted. Since this action clearly involves  
 9 questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to MDL 2641, Defendants  
 10 anticipate that the JPML will quickly issue a Conditional Transfer Order for this case. Further, once  
 11 transfer is final, the plaintiff’s ability to raise jurisdictional objections will not be prejudiced. There  
 12 is nothing in the record indicating that Judge Campbell will unduly delay hearing any objections to  
 13 federal jurisdiction. Additionally, the plaintiff has expended limited resources to date, as this action  
 14 is still in its infancy, and discovery has not yet commenced. Thus, Plaintiff will not suffer prejudice  
 15 as a result of a stay. *See C.A. by Allen v. Pfizer, Inc.*, Case No: C 13-4087 SBA, 2013 WL 6091766,  
 16 at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2013) (“[T]here is no evidence that Plaintiffs will be unduly prejudiced or  
 17 inconvenienced by a stay.”); *Yuan v. Lewey*, No. C 13-04010 WHA, 2013 WL 5954900, at \*1 (N.D.  
 18 Cal. Oct. 28, 2013) (“Plaintiffs will not be prejudiced by this brief stay pending the MDL’s  
 19 determination to transfer.”); *Tucker v. Organon USA, Inc.*, No. C 13-00728 SBA, 2013 WL  
 20 2255884, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2013) (“[T]here is no evidence that Plaintiffs will be unduly  
 21 prejudiced or inconvenienced by a temporary stay”).

22 Conversely, if a stay is not granted in cases such as this one, Defendants will suffer the  
 23 prejudice of potentially inconsistent rulings by individual federal district courts. Further, in the time  
 24 before the case is transferred, Defendants will have to engage in parallel proceedings in numerous  
 25 courts while being temporarily denied full benefit of the highly organized process of the MDL  
 26 proceedings, which was established in part to conserve the resources of parties, their counsel, and the  
 27 judiciary. *See, e.g., C.A. by Allen*, 2013 WL 6091766, at \*2 (“Defendants may suffer hardship and  
 28 inequity if a stay is not imposed. If this Court prematurely adjudicates Plaintiffs’ motion to remand,  
 Case No.: 3:15-cv-05189-EMC

1 Defendants may be forced to re-litigate issues before the MDL Panel or in state court.”). Notably,  
 2 even if this Court were to properly deny a motion to remand by the plaintiff, Judge Campbell might  
 3 revisit the issue upon transfer, forcing Defendants to re-litigate the same issue in two different  
 4 courts. As a Court in this District succinctly put it in granting a stay and deferring ruling on a  
 5 plaintiff’s motion to remand in a recent case:

6 [T]he court finds that [Defendant] will face significant hardship if its motion to  
 7 stay the proceedings is not granted. If this court denies plaintiffs’ motion, and the  
 8 case is later transferred, the MDL court could revisit the issue, thus forcing  
 9 [Defendant] to relitigate it. . . . If, on the other hand, this court grants the remand  
 10 motion and the MDL later decides that removal in similar cases was proper,  
 [Defendant] would be prejudiced by having to litigate the case in state court  
 instead of before the MDL. . . . Should this court deny the motion to stay,  
 [Defendant] would be left with two unfavorable alternatives that expose it to a  
 significant risk of duplicative litigation and prejudice.

11 *Jones v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, No. C 13-2415 PJH, 2013 WL 3388659, at \*3 (N.D. Cal.  
 12 Jul. 8, 2013).

13 Therefore, to promote consistency and judicial efficiency, and to prevent undue prejudice to  
 14 Defendants, a stay is proper.

### 15 III. CONCLUSION

16 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.  
 17 respectfully request that the Court grant the motion to stay all proceedings pending a ruling on  
 18 transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to MDL 2641; relieve the parties of any  
 19 pleading, discovery, or other obligation until further notice of the Court; and administratively close  
 20 this case pending a ruling on transfer to MDL 2641.

21  
 22 DATED: November 17, 2015

23 REED SMITH LLP  
 24  
 25 By: /s/ Steven J. Boranian  
 26 Steven J. Boranian  
 27 Mark A. Sentenac  
 28 Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and  
 Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.